Leptonic CP problem in left-right symmetric model

Ravi Kuchimanchi*

We find using the minimal left-right symmetric model that the presence of leptonic CP violation can radiatively generate a strong CP phase at the one-loop level itself, which can be beyond the current bounds established by the neutron electic dipole moment experiments. If there are no axions or unnatural cancellations, this leads to the testable prediction that leptonic CP violation must be negligibly small (Dirac phase $\delta_{CP} = 0$ or π), in wide and interesting regions of parameter space.

arXiv:1408.6382v3 [hep-ph] 7 Apr 2015

Introduction –

One of the most attractive extensions of the standard model is the left-right symmetric model [1] based on $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \times P$ that restores parity as a good symmetry of the Lagrangian. The model requires the introduction of 3 right handed neutrinos, which are parity partners of the left handed neutrinos, and thereby provides a strong reason for neutrino masses and mixings. Interestingly, the QCD vacuum angle θ_{QCD} is absent in the left-right P symmetric (LR) model as it is parity odd, and the strong CP phase $\bar{\theta}$ (that contributes to the neutron's electric dipole moment) is calculable in terms of the other parameters of the Lagrangian.

In the standard model, if we set the tree-level strong CP parameter $\bar{\theta}$ to zero by hand, it is not produced radiatively till the third loop and is negligibly small ($\bar{\theta} \sim 10^{-16}$) [2]. In the left-right symmetric model, the parity-odd $\bar{\theta}$ would be zero had P remained unbroken. However a single CP violating quartic term in the Higgs potential can generate a large $\bar{\theta}$ at the tree level once parity is spontaneously broken. If there are no unnatural cancellations between tree-level and radiative contributions to $\bar{\theta}$, the coupling α_2 of this quartic term must be nearly real (or CP conserving), so that its tree-level contribution to $\bar{\theta}$ is within the experimental bound $\lesssim 10^{-10}$ (or zero). We can ask in which loop order it is generated from other phases. Just like in the standard model, it was shown that even in the left-right model, $\bar{\theta}$ is not generated up to the third loop [3]. However this calculation (see last two paragraphs of Ref [4]) in the left-right model had only looked at CP violating radiative corrections from the CKM phase of the quark sector.

In this letter we show that CP violation in the leptonic sector can radiatively generate a complex phase in α_2 and thereby the strong CP phase $\bar{\theta}$, at the one-loop level itself. Moreover if the Dirac-type Yukawa terms in the leptonic sector are similar to their quark sector counterparts, for a wide region in parameter space that includes all of type 2 dominance, and some interesting regions of type 1 seesaw mechanism with right handed breaking scale $v_R \lesssim 10^{15} GeV$, the strong CP phase generated from the leptonic phases exceeds the bound $\bar{\theta} \leq 10^{-10}$ set by neutron EDM experiments. Thus we predict that leptonic CP violation must be absent or unobservably small in the left-right symmetric model with the above provisions, and thereby we may be able to test if parity is restored in laws of nature at some scales well beyond collider reach. Moreover, if all the neutrino Dirac Yukawas are similar to the electron's Yukawa coupling, we find using Type 2 seesaw that $\delta_{CP} \lesssim 1/30$ if $v_R \sim 1TeV$, while for $v_R \sim 10TeV$ an observable neutron EDM is generated.

It is worth noting that there are axionless solutions to the strong CP problem that restore CP at a relaxation scale above v_R, such that even after spontaneous or soft CP breaking, α_2 is naturally real at the relaxation or cut-off scale, while the CKM phase is generated [5]. These solutions are discussed towards the end of the letter.

That a complex α_2 is generated from phases in the leptonic sector, should have shown up in the one-loop Renormalization Group Equations of the left-right symmetric model which were evaluated in [6]. However the RG equations obtained in that work do not contain the contribution to the imaginary part of α_2 (denoted by λ_{11} in [6] and α_{2I} in this work) from the phases in leptonic Yukawa matrices. More recent work such as [7] also does not find CP violating one loop contributions to $\bar{\theta}$, if α_2 is real or CP conserving at tree level. Our result is a significant departure from all previous works which concluded or assumed that α_{2I} (and therefore $\bar{\theta}$), once set to zero at the tree-level, does not pick up CP violating radiative corrections at the one loop level in the LR model.

The excessive one loop corrections imply that for the smallness of $\bar{\theta}$ to be natural in a technical sense, in important regions of parameter space of the non-supersymmetric LR model, the strong CP problem *must* be solved by introducing an axion, or else the leptonic CP violating phases must be suppressed, which is testable.

In supersymmetic models, that phases from *soft* trilinear terms involving the sleptons can contribute to $\bar{\theta}$ in one loop was found in [8]. However that work had to abandon the calculation of $\bar{\theta}$ from leptonic phases in non-supersymmetric models with two Higgs doublets, since there are contributions to $\bar{\theta}$ from imaginary parts of parameters of quadratically divergent dimension 2 Higgs mass terms, which *have* to be fine tuned due to the Hierarchy problem (see [8]). However in the LR model all dimension 2 Higgs mass parameters are real due to P, and there is no imaginary part to quadratic divergences. Thus there is no roadblock to calculating the radiative contribution from leptonic phases, and it is well known that $\bar{\theta}$ is finite and calculable in the LR model with P.

Connection between Strong and Leptonic CP violation –

We consider the minimal Left-Right symmetric model [1] based on $G_{LR} \equiv SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \times P$, with scalar triplets Δ_R (1, 1, 3, 2) and Δ_L (1, 3, 1, 2), and bi-doublet ϕ (1, 2, 2, 0). Under parity (P), the space-time coordinates $(x,t) \to (-x,t)$, $\phi \to \phi^\dagger$ and subscripts $L \leftrightarrow R$ for all other fields (see for example [9]). The scalar fields have the form

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^o & \phi_2^+ \\ \phi_1^- & \phi_2^o \end{pmatrix}, \ \Delta_{L,R} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{L,R}^+/\sqrt{2} & \delta_{L,R}^{++} \\ \delta_{L,R}^o & -\delta_{L,R}^+/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1}$$

As is well known, all parameters of the Higgs potential are real due to P, except α_2 in the CP violating term [9]

$$V = \left[\alpha_2 Tr\left(\Delta_R^\dagger \Delta_R\right) + \alpha_2^\star Tr\left(\Delta_L^\dagger \Delta_L\right)\right] Tr\left(\tilde{\phi}^\dagger \phi\right) + h.c. \tag{2}$$

where $\tilde{\phi} = \tau_2 \phi^\star \tau_2$. If α_2 is complex, once δ_R^o picks up a vacuum expectation value (VEV) $\langle \delta_R^o \rangle = v_R/\sqrt{2} >> \langle \delta_L^o \rangle$, the above term generates a CP violating coupling between the two standard model doublets in the bi-doublet ϕ. This causes the VEV $\langle \phi_2^o \rangle \equiv k_2 e^{i\alpha}/\sqrt{2}$ of the neutral component of the second standard model doublet to pick up a phase (α), where we have chosen a basis so that $\langle \phi_1^o \rangle \equiv k_1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\langle \delta_R^o \rangle$ are real, and the weak scale $v_{wk}^2 = |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2$. The up and down quark mass matrices (M_u and M_d) are no longer Hermitian, as they are obtained from Yukawa couplings of the quarks that are Hermitian (due to P), and Higgs bi-doublet VEVs that are no longer all real. The strong CP phase

$$\bar{\theta} = \arg\det(M_u M_d) \sim (\alpha_{2I}/\alpha_3)(m_t/m_b) \tag{3}$$

therefore gets generated from the non-Hermitian mass matrices, and has been written in terms of the imaginary part of $\alpha_2 (= \alpha_{2R} + i\alpha_{2I})$, and the top to bottom quark mass ratio. α_3 is the real coupling of the term $\alpha_3 Tr(\phi^\dagger \phi \Delta_R \Delta_R^\dagger)$ that keeps the potential stable, and as noted in [9] generates the mass $\sqrt{\alpha_3/2} v_R$ for the second standard model doublet. Since experimentally [10] $\bar{\theta} \lesssim 10^{-10}$, it is crucial that α_{2I} is close to zero to a high degree. However we will show that, if α_2 is chosen to be real at the tree level (with a cut-off scale $> v_R$), a dangerous contribution to α_{2I} is generated at the one loop level from the leptonic Yukawa terms given below:

$$h_{ij}^\ell \bar{L}_{iL} \phi L_{jR} + \tilde{h}_{ij}^\ell \bar{L}_{iL} \tilde{\phi} L_{jR} + i f_{ij} \left(L_{iR}^T \tau_2 C \Delta_R L_{jR} + L_{iL}^T \tau_2 C \Delta_L L_{jL}\right) + H.c. \tag{4}$$

where for example, $\bar{L}_{1R}$ is the first generation leptonic doublet $(\bar{\nu} \ \ \bar{e})_R$, and 3×3 Yukawa matrices h^ℓ and $\tilde{h}^\ell$ are Hermitian due to P, while f is a complex, symmetric 3×3 matrix that generates Majorana terms for neutrinos.

The above Lagrangian radiatively generates a logarithmically divergent contribution to α_{2I} through the box diagrams of Figure 1, so that

$$\alpha_{2I} \sim \frac{i}{16\pi^2} Tr\left(f^\dagger f \left[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell\right]\right) \ln\left(v_R/M_{Pl}\right)^2 \tag{5}$$



FIG. 1. One loop contribution to α_{2I} from leptonic Yukawas of eq. (4), with $\phi_1^o = \phi_1^R + i\phi_1^I$, $\phi_2^o = \phi_2^R + i\phi_2^I$ and $\delta_R^o = \delta_R^R + i\delta_R^I$ in eq. (1). This leads to a VEV for ϕ_2^I and generates $\bar{\theta}$.

where we note that $i[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell]$ and $f^\dagger f$ are Hermitian matrices, and the cut-off has been taken to be at the Planck scale $M_{Pl} > v_R$. Note that there is no suppression in eq. (5) by a factor such as $(v_{wk}/v_R)^2$ or $(v_R/M_{Pl})^2$, and hence this contribution can be dangerously large, even if v_R scale is well above the TeV scale.

Equation (5) with (3) generates $\bar{\theta}$ in the quark sector from leptonic Yukawas and CP violation therein, and provides the following severe constraint on the leptonic sector that is being probed by neutrino experiments:

$$\left|Tr\left(f^\dagger f \left[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell\right]\right)\right| \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-11} \tag{6}$$

where we have substituted $\bar{\theta} \leq 10^{-10}, m_t/m_b \sim 40, \alpha_3 \lesssim 1$ and took the logarithm to have a generic value ~ 10. Taking the Hermitian conjugate of (6) it can be seen that if $f^\dagger f, h^\ell$, and $\tilde{h}^\ell$ have all real matrix elements (conserve CP), then the left hand side vanishes. On the other hand, as we will now see, if they have complex phases these can be constrained by the above equation.

We will now consider the well motivated case where the leptonic Dirac Yukawa couplings are similar to their quark counterparts. This for example would be the case if there is an ultra-violet completion with a semi-unified theory such as the Pati-Salam model with $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, or grand unified theory such as $SO(10)$. This implies that the matrix $[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell]$ has some off-diagonal matrix elements that are of the order $\sim V_{ts}(m_b/m_t) \gtrsim 3\times10^{-4}$, in a basis in which either h^ℓ or $\tilde{h}^\ell$, like its quark counterpart is diagonal. Even if there is no unification, that the quark and leptonic Dirac type Yukawa matrices could be similar is hinted by the fact that the charged lepton masses are similar to the down sector quark masses.

With the above, equation (6) implies that some off diagonal matrix elements

$$\left|\left(f^\dagger f\right)_{ij}\right| \lesssim 10^{-7} \tag{7}$$

if there are $O(1)$ CP phases present in $f^\dagger f$ or in $[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell]$.

The Yukawa matrix f leads to Majorana mass terms for neutrinos once δ_R^o picks up a large VEV $\sim v_R/\sqrt{2}$

and δ_L^o picks up an induced VEV $\sim \gamma v_{wk}^2/v_R$ where γ which is symbolically β/ρ is obtained from real quartic couplings β_i and ρ_i of the Higgs potential [9] (which has terms such as $\rho_1^2 Tr(\Delta_R^\dagger \Delta_R)^2 + R \to L$), and is real at tree level. Since no symmetries can protect ρ_i, we have in general, $\rho_i \gtrsim 0.01$ and therefore, $|\gamma| \lesssim 100$. The light neutrino mass matrix is given by the well known seesaw mechanism [11] and has the form

$$M_\nu = \frac{v_{wk}^2}{v_R}\left[\gamma f - h_D\left(\frac{1}{f}\right)h_D^T\right] \tag{8}$$

where $h_D = (k_1 h^\ell + k_2 e^{-i\alpha}\tilde{h}^\ell)/v_{wk}$ is the Dirac type Yukawa matrix for the neutrinos.

If the first term in the square brackets of eq. (8) dominates over the second term, we have a Type 2 seesaw mechanism. Taking the third generation Yukawas to be larger than the rest of the Yukawas, for the first term to dominate, we must have $f_{33} > h_{D_{33}}/\sqrt{|\gamma|}$. Since we have assumed that leptonic Dirac type and quark Yukawas are similar, we take $h_{D_{33}} \sim h_t \gtrsim 0.3$. Substituting $|\gamma| \lesssim 100$ we have for Type 2 seesaw mechanism, $f_{33} \gtrsim 0.03$. Since $M_\nu \approx f\gamma v_{wk}^2/v_R$ for type 2 seesaw, and we know by light neutrino experiments that the leptonic mixing angles are large we have for the off diagonal matrix elements, $f_{3j} \sim f_{33}$ *to* $f_{33}/10$. Thus we obtain $|(f^\dagger f)_{3j}| \gtrsim 10^{-4}$.

Comparing the above with eq. (7) we can see that the leptonic Dirac phase δ_{CP} cannot be of the order 1, and must be less than 10^{-3} from its CP conserving value of 0 or π. Note that in this case of type 2 seesaw, the Majorana CP violating phases are unconstrained since they do not occur in $M_\nu^\dagger M_\nu \propto f^\dagger f$ or in $[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell]$.

Currently experiments are being planned or underway to measure δ_{CP} with a sensitivity of 5^o (or ~ 0.1) [12], similar to sensitivity achieved for the CKM phase. The absence of a measurable δ_{CP} (modulo π) for the above well motivated case, is a key prediction of this work.

We now consider the case of type 1 seesaw where the second term in eq. (8) dominates. Substituting $h_{D_{33}} \sim 0.3$ we find that for type 1 seesaw, $f_{33} v_R \sim 10^{14} GeV$ so that $h_{D_{33}}^2 v_{wk}^2/(f_{33} v_R) \sim \sqrt{|\Delta m_{32}^2|} \sim 0.05 eV$, where we have used the mass squared difference of light neutrinos [12] $|\Delta m_{32}^2| \sim 0.0023 eV^2$ and $v_{wk} \sim 246 GeV$.

If $v_R \sim 10^{18} GeV$, we must have $f_{33} \sim 10^{-4}$ and we can see that the off-diagonal terms of $f^\dagger f$ will satisfy eq. (7), and there is no constraint on the leptonic CP phases. On the other hand if $v_R \sim 10^{15\ to\ 14} GeV$, then $f_{33} \sim 0.1\ to\ 1$. For type 1 seesaw since f is more hierarchical, we take $f_{23} \sim f_{33}/1000$ (f_{23} would be about $f_{33}/100$ but we allow for an additional factor of 10 since the phases in f_{23} could be order $\delta_{CP}/10$). Comparing now with eq. (7) we once again find that leptonic CP phases cannot be order 1 and must be constrained to be $\lesssim 10^{-(2\ to\ 4)}$, modulo π. This is another key prediction. Note also that for type 1 seesaw, since both Majorana and Dirac phases can be present in $f^\dagger f$, all the CP phases are constrained.

So far we have looked at cases where quark and leptonic Dirac Yukawas are similar. We now relax this assumption to consider an example where v_R can be at the TeV scale. In a basis where charged lepton masses are diagonal, if all neutrino Dirac Yukawas including those of the third generation such as $h_{D_{3j}} \sim 10^{-5}$ to $10^{-6} \sim h_{3j}^\ell$, so that they are similar to the smallest known (electron's) Yukawa coupling, then v_R can be $\sim 1 TeV$. This determines $f_{33} \sim 1$, since the second term in eq. (8) should not give a contribution much greater than the observed $0.0023 eV^2$for light neutrino mass-squared differences. Moreover, $[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell]$ can have off-diagonal elements of the order $10^{-6} \times 10^{-2} = 10^{-8}$, since both h_D and charged fermion masses (with Yukawa of $\tau^-, h_\tau \sim 10^{-2} \sim \tilde{h}_{33}^\ell$) must arise from h^ℓ and $\tilde{h}^\ell$. For type 2 seesaw, $f_{3j} \sim f_{33}/10 \sim 1/10$ and so we find that the left hand side of eq. (6) is $\sim 10^{-9}\delta_{CP}$ and therefore δ_{CP} cannot be order 1 and is $\sim 1/30$. However if $v_R \sim 10 TeV$ (so that $f_{33} \gtrsim 0.1$), then $\delta_{CP} \sim 1$ maybe allowed and can result in an observable neutron EDM ($\bar{\theta} \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{-11}\delta_{CP}$). Null results in future nEDM experiments probing $\bar{\theta} \sim 10^{-12}$ may further constrain δ_{CP}.

Strong CP solution – We have not assumed anything beyond the minimal left-right symmetric model to obtain the connection between leptonic and strong CP violation. It is clear that if the leptonic CP phases are $O(1)$, then $\bar{\theta}$ may have to be fine tuned to cancel excessive one-loop radiative corrections, making it technically unnatural. On the other hand if leptonic phases and α_{2I} are zero at the tree level, there could be an underlying symmetry reason. This motivates us to look at solutions to the strong CP problem.

If we extend the model by adding an axion, then $\bar{\theta}$ dynamically relaxes to zero [13]. However since P sets the QCD vacuum angle to zero, historically it has been hoped that there would be an axionless solution in the LR model. An early attempt was made in [14] by adding an additional bi-doublet, and invoking a discrete symmetry. However after symmetry breaking the CKM phase is not generated, and the problem remained unsolved. Later it was noted that α_2 is automatically absent in SUSYLR models and the strong CP problem can be thus solved [15]. However it was shown for the SUSYLR solution, that without any further constraints, the radiatively generated $\bar{\theta} \sim 10^{-8}\ to\ 10^{-10}$ [16] which is uncomfortably close to the experimental bound, while a solution in the LR model (without supersymmetry), continued to be elusive [17] at the turn of the century.

Recently, progress was made by adding one heavy vectorlike quark family to the minimal LR model, and breaking both P and CP spontaneously so that α_{2I} naturally vanishes at the CP restoration scale [5]. CP is spontaneously broken by the VEV of a P even, CP odd real scalar singlet whose Yukawa couplings mix the usual and vectorlike quarks and generate the CKM phase. Since

P is not broken by the singlet VEV, the resultant tree-level quark mass matrices are Hermitian, thus solving the strong CP problem without requiring supersymmetry. The solution also works without the scalar singlet, if CP is broken softly by mass terms involving the vectorlike quarks [5].

The interesting thing is that in the minimal version of the above solution, since a vectorlike lepton family is not introduced, no CP violation is generated in the lepton sector! Thus it predicts that not only α_{2I} but also the Dirac (δ_{CP}) and Majorana leptonic phases vanish (modulo π), as noted in [18] and detailed in [19]. It is remarkable that the solution addresses perfectly the issues raised in this work.

However if a vectorlike lepton family is introduced then δ_{CP} can be generated. This work shows that it would in turn generate too high a $\bar{\theta}$, in wide and interesting regions of parameter space, and hence the solution that includes a vectorlike lepton family may be disfavored.

Neutron EDM in axionless LR solution – If $v_R << M$, we just have the minimal LR model below M (mass of the vector-like quark family or equivalently the scale of CP breaking). Radiative corrections from heavy quarks introduce a slight non-Hermiticity in the light quark mass matrices and generate a finite and calculable $\bar{\theta}$. This was estimated in [5, 18], and it was found that contribution from terms at the one-loop level are of the form,

$$\bar{\theta} \sim \frac{1}{16\pi^2}(Product\ of\ Yukawas)\left[\frac{v_R}{M}\right]^2 \qquad (9)$$

where the term in the round brackets is essentially a product of a string of up and down quark Yukawa matrices with the standard model Higgs doublet, and includes one Yukawa inverse. The two loop contribution has terms of a similar form with a longer Yukawa string in the product and an additional factor of $(4\pi)^{-2}$.

If $M \sim M_{Pl} \sim 10^{18} GeV$ and $v_R \sim 10^{14}$ to $10^{15} GeV$, then the above implies $\bar{\theta} \sim 10^{-12}$ to 10^{-10} if the product of Yukawas in the round brackets is $\sim h_t^2 V_{ts} \sim 1/100$. If some unknown Yukawas involving heavy quarks are smaller, it can further reduce $\bar{\theta}$.

An important feature in the above radiative corrections due to the heavy quarks is the suppression factor $(v_R/M)^2$. This is because as $M \to \infty$ the vector like quarks decouple. Additionally, if there are Planck scale corrections due to non-renormalizable terms, they will induce a $\bar{\theta}_{Pl} \sim \lambda v_R^2/(M M_{Pl})$, where λ is a dimensionless parameter and M is the soft CP breaking scale for the minimal Higgs content without a singlet. Thus the radiatively generated $\bar{\theta}$ due to vector like quarks, and Planck scale corrections are both suppressed by $(v_R/M_{Pl})^2$ for $M \sim M_{Pl}$. Even if v_R is small enough that both are undetectable, we still have the testable prediction that leptonic phases vanish (modulo π) in the axionless model.

Conclusions – We have shown that presence of leptonic CP violation can radiatively generate an excessive strong CP phase at the one loop level in the minimal left-right symmetric model with P, that is beyond the limits already established by the neutron EDM experiments for the following interesting regions of parameter space:

- if the leptonic and quark Dirac type Yukawa couplings are similar then
  - for all regions of Type 2 dominant seesaw.
  - for $v_R \lesssim 10^{15} GeV$ with Type 1 seesaw.
- if the Dirac Yukawa couplings of the neutrinos, $h_{D_{3j}} \sim 10^{-5}$ to 10^{-6}, so that $v_R \sim 1\ TeV$, then for Type 2 seesaw.

In the above significant regions of parameter space, technical naturalness implies that leptonic CP phases (particularly δ_{CP}) must vanish or be negligibly small (modulo π), unless there are axions. The result is important as it gives us a way to test if parity is restored in the laws of nature, even if it is at scales $\sim 10^{15} GeV$ that are well beyond collider reach, in some well motivated regions of parameter space of the axionless minimal LR model. In the second bullet point of the above, if $v_R \sim 10\ TeV$ then an observable neutron EDM ($\bar{\theta} \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{-11} \delta_{CP}$) is generated.

In general, we can think of a theory as being afflicted with a leptonic CP problem if leptonic phases generate an excessive strong CP phase radiatively or through RGE running from higher scales.

I thank Rabi Mohapatra and Kaustubh Agashe for helpful comments on the manuscript.

* ravi@aidindia.org

[1] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 275 (1974); R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, Phys. Rev. D **11**, 566 (1975); G. Senjanovic and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 1502 (1975).

[2] J. R. Ellis and M. K. Gaillard, Nucl.Phys. **B150**, 141 (1979).

[3] Though [4] does not specifically mention the strong CP phase, the radiatively generated CP violating quartic term of the Higgs potential, obtained in the 4th loop order in that work, contributes to the Higgs bidoublet VEVs and generates a strong CP phase.

[4] M. Gronau and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys.Lett. **B168**, 248 (1986).

[5] R. Kuchimanchi, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 116008 (2010), arXiv:1009.5961 [hep-ph].

[6] I. Rothstein, Nucl.Phys. **B358**, 181 (1991).

[7] A. Maiezza and M. Nemevek, Phys.Rev. **D90**, 095002 (2014), arXiv:1407.3678 [hep-ph].

[8] A. Dedes and M. Pospelov, Phys.Rev. **D61**, 116010 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9912293 [hep-ph].

[9] P. Duka, J. Gluza, and M. Zralek, Annals Phys. **280**, 336 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9910279.

[10] C. A. Baker, D. D. Doyle, P. Geltenbort, K. Green, M. G. D. van der Grinten, P. G. Harris, P. Iaydjiev, S. N. Ivanov, D. J. R. May, J. M. Pendlebury, J. D. Richardson, D. Shiers, and K. F. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 131801 (2006).

[11] P. Minkowski, Phys.Lett. **B67**, 421 (1977); M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, *Supergravity*, ed. by D. Freedman and P. Van Nieuwenhuizen, North Holland, Amsterdam, 315-321 (1979); T. Yanagida, Progress of Theoretical Physics **64**, 1103 (1980); R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys.Rev.Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).

[12] A. de Gouvea *et al.* (Intensity Frontier Neutrino Working Group), (2013), arXiv:1310.4340 [hep-ex].

[13] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977).

[14] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys.Lett. **B79**, 283 (1978).

[15] R. Kuchimanchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3486 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9511376; R. N. Mohapatra and A. Rasin, Phys.Rev.Lett. **76**, 3490 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9511391 [hep-ph].

[16] K. Babu, B. Dutta, and R. Mohapatra, Phys.Rev. **D65**, 016005 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0107100 [hep-ph].

[17] R. N. Mohapatra, A. Rasin, and G. Senjanovic, Phys.Rev.Lett. **79**, 4744 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9707281 [hep-ph].

[18] R. Kuchimanchi, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 036002 (2012), arXiv:1203.2772 [hep-ph].

[19] R. Kuchimanchi, Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, 2726 (2014).